



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/715,012

11/17/2003

Samuli Stromberg

79707

3322

22242

7590

09/22/2004

FITCH EVEN TABIN AND FLANNERY
120 SOUTH LA SALLE STREET
SUITE 1600
CHICAGO, IL 60603-3406

EXAMINER

HESS, DANIEL A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2876

DATE MAILED: 09/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/715,012

Applicant(s)

STROMBERG ET AL.

Examiner

Daniel A Hess

Art Unit

2876

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☒ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/17/2003.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

The applicant has claimed priority based on PCT/FI02/00444 filed 5/23/2002, which claims priority to Finland 20011140 filed 5/31/2001. However, no record of the above has been received in the electronic file wrapper.

The applicant is advised that at least the first of these two documents is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 4-9 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 4, the thermoplastic material is recited as being a conductive film. However, the examiner observes that if a layer between two capacitive plates is conductive, those plates cease to act as capacitors, since electricity flows freely between the two plates and a short is created. Appropriate clarification / correction is required.

In claim 5, there is an similar contradiction as in claim 4; in claim 5, the contradiction is even more explicit: The claim recites an anisotropic **conductive** film as forming a **dielectric** layer. However, the American Heritage Dictionary defines a dielectric as, "A nonconductor of electricity, especially a substance with electrical conductivity of less than a millionth (10^{-6}) of a siemens." Appropriate clarification / correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Seiichi (JP 2000057287), **of record in the applicant's information disclosure**. Seiichi has a chip card having all of the elements and means as recited in claims 1-3. For example, Seiichi teaches the following:

Re claim 1: See especially figure 1(a) – 1(c); see also abstract, which is taken to be a fair representation of the invention. There a circuitry pattern (figure 1b) on a smart label substrate (ref. 1b). There is a structural part (figure 1a) having an IC. As figure 1(c) shows, layers 1A and 1B are brought together and connected by capacitors 4, 5, and 6 of 1A which form a capacitive electrical connection to corresponding opposite plates 7, 8 and 9, as is well-shown in figure 1(c).

Re claim 2: See figure (1b): there are at least two capacitors connected in series located outside of the chip, namely, either 7 and 8 or 7 and 9, which are in series.

Art Unit: 2876

Re claim 3: See translation, page 2, [0014]: the intervening layer 10 of figure 1(c) binding the two layers is a thermoplastic layer.

Re claim 9: A figure 1c illustrates, the IC is located between the thermoplastic material and a substrate.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later

Art Unit: 2876

invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seiichi.

Polyimide and polyester are typical materials for a substrate of a card, being inexpensive, easily formed, and durable.

Claims 11 and 12 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seiichi in view of Asplund. The teachings of Seiichi have been discussed above.

Seiichi teaches the final recited product in full, but fails to teach the means of attachment by carrier web.

Asplund teaches (see especially figures 3 and 4) bringing layers together via carrier webs that deliver various components that are then brought together.

In view of Asplund's teaching, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the old and well-known carrier webs to deliver components that are then brought together because this can result in faster and cheaper production.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Orihara (EP 0 737 935) teaches using anisotropic conductive adhesive to connect a chip with an antenna-bearing substrate on a smart card..

Art Unit: 2876

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel A Hess whose telephone number is (571) 272-2392. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM - 5:00 PM M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G Lee can be reached on (571) 272-2398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



DH

Daniel A Hess
Examiner
Art Unit 2876

**DANIEL STCYR
PRIMARY EXAMINER**

